

The Open Court

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE

Devoted to the Science of Religion, the Religion of Science, and the
Extension of the Religious Parliament Idea

Editor: DR. PAUL CARUS.

Associates: { E. C. HEGELER.
 { MARY CARUS.

VOL. XXIII. (No. 6.) JUNE, 1909. NO. 637.

CONTENTS:

	PAGE
<i>Frontispiece.</i> Goethe in Mature Years. J. K. STIELER.	
<i>Some Fallacies of the Peacemakers.</i> EDITOR.	321
<i>Revelations of an Ex-Medium</i> (Concluded).	340
<i>Classical and Romantic Literature:</i> Comments on Goethe's Poem "Nature and Art" (Illustrated). EDITOR.	363
<i>Judas and the Kingdom.</i> DUDLEY WRIGHT.	374
<i>The Mystic Number Nine.</i> WILLIAM BENJAMIN SMITH.	380
<i>Memorial Addresses in Japan.</i>	383
<i>Book Reviews and Notes.</i>	383

CHICAGO

The Open Court Publishing Company

LONDON: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., Ltd.

Per copy, 10 cents (sixpence). Yearly, \$1.00 (in the U.P.U., 5s. 6d.).



The Open Court

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE

Devoted to the Science of Religion, the Religion of Science, and the
Extension of the Religious Parliament Idea

Editor: DR. PAUL CARUS.

Associates: { E. C. HEGELER.
MARY CARUS.

VOL. XXIII. (No. 6.)

JUNE, 1909.

NO. 637.

CONTENTS:

	PAGE
<i>Frontispiece.</i> Goethe in Mature Years. J. K. STIELER.	
<i>Some Fallacies of the Peacemakers.</i> EDITOR.	321
<i>Revelations of an Ex-Medium</i> (Concluded).	340
<i>Classical and Romantic Literature:</i> Comments on Goethe's Poem "Nature and Art" (Illustrated). EDITOR.	363
<i>Judas and the Kingdom.</i> DUDLEY WRIGHT.	374
<i>The Mystic Number Nine.</i> WILLIAM BENJAMIN SMITH.	380
<i>Memorial Addresses in Japan.</i>	383
<i>Book Reviews and Notes.</i>	383

CHICAGO

The Open Court Publishing Company

LONDON: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., Ltd.

Per copy, 10 cents (sixpence). Yearly, \$1.00 (in the U.P.U., 5s. 6d.).

Periodical Publications of The Open Court Publishing Company

THE OPEN COURT

AN ILLUSTRATED MONTHLY MAGAZINE

Devoted to the Science of Religion, the Religion of Science, and the
Extension of the Religious Parliament Idea

Editor: DR. PAUL CARUS

Associates: { E. C. HEGELER
 { MARY CARUS

An Unpartisan Organ of Religious, Ethical, Philosophical and Scientific Expression,
Contributed to by the Leaders of Science in all Countries, and by the
Leaders of Religion of all Denominations.

THERE is no conflict between religion and science, but there is a conflict between scientific truth and religious dogma. Dogmas are symbols which express religious truth in more or less appropriate allegories. They are not the truth itself. A belief in the letter of dogmas indicates indolence and the lack of genuine religion. The old dogmatism must be surrendered and will have to give place to a higher and more religious conception, which from the methods employed is called "The Religion of Science."

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION

Postpaid, \$1.00 a year for the U. S. and Mexico; Canada, \$1.25; for
countries in the Universal Postal Union, 5s. 6d. Single copies, 10c (6d.)

A fair impression of the work of THE OPEN COURT may be obtained from the
Twenty Year Index, recently published. Sent free on request to readers of this advertisement.

THE MONIST

A QUARTERLY MAGAZINE

Devoted to the Philosophy of Science

Editor: DR. PAUL CARUS.

Associates: { E. C. HEGELER
 { MARY CARUS

THE PHILOSOPHY OF SCIENCE is an application of the scientific method to philosophy. It is a systematization of positive facts; it takes experience as its foundation, and uses the formal relations of experience (mathematics, logic, etc.) as its method. All truths form one consistent system and any dualism of irreconcilable statements indicates a problem arising from either faulty reasoning or an insufficient knowledge of facts. Science *always* implies Monism *i. e.* a unitary world-conception.

"The Monist" also discusses the Fundamental Problems of Philosophy in their Relations to all the Practical Religious, Ethical and Sociological Questions of the Day.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION

In the U. S., Canada and Mexico, yearly, postpaid, \$2.00; single
copies, 60 cents. In England and the U. P. U., yearly, 9s. 6d.; single
numbers, 2s. 6d.

An index covering seventeen years of THE MONIST will be sent to any interested reader, desiring to become acquainted with the work and the standing of its contributors.

The Open Court Publishing Co.

P. O. Drawer F.

CHICAGO, ILL.

London: KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRÜBNER, & CO. Ltd.



GOETHE IN MATURE YEARS.

After the painting of J. K. Stieler, 1828.

Frontispiece to The Open Court.

THE OPEN COURT

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE

Devoted to the Science of Religion, the Religion of Science, and
the Extension of the Religious Parliament Idea.

VOL. XXIII. (No. 6.)

JUNE, 1909.

NO. 637.

Copyright by The Open Court Publishing Company, 1909.

SOME FALLACIES OF THE PEACEMAKERS.

BY THE EDITOR.

MOLTKE used to say, "War is a part of the divine world-order," but he is also reported to have acknowledged that "even a victorious war is a misfortune"; and to complete his views on the subject we will add a third dictum of his: "The purpose of every war is the establishment of peace." None of these sayings need be contradictory; they may all be true, for life is a struggle, and every struggle involves risks of wounds and of defeat which in desperate cases means death. Life is not a play for fun like children's games. Life is a serious conflict for success and sometimes a very strenuous competition among all those who have a chance of survival. Some always go to the wall and few only can be in the lead, but all are subject to suffering, and there is not one who can escape death.

It has been said that "war is hell," but a pessimist (a man like Schopenhauer) can rightly declare that since the whole world is but a large battlefield, all life is hell, and we can temporarily build up a heaven in it only by daring courage and unflagging energy in struggling with all the evils that beset us.

A well-known Roman proverb runs "*Si vis pacem para bellum*," "wouldst thou have peace, prepare for war," and these words incorporate the experience of millenniums. Perhaps we may add the reverse: "Wouldst thou conjure upon any country the clouds of war, induce its government to disarm; to indulge exclusively in the joys of peace, and to imitate the lamb, the symbol of peaceable innocence and perfect goodness."

In order to have peace, we need the good will of all parties concerned, but a brawl may be caused in any company by but one disturbing element. Peace breakers can be kept in order only by

the strong hand of those who are willing to fight for order and to bring any unruly spirit into submission.

Peace has been the desire of the nations since the beginning of the human race, and the choir of the angels promised "Glory to God in the highest and peace on earth to the men of good will."¹ Wars have been lessened since then, but they have never been abolished and even to-day the great world-powers are ready and prepared to go to war if it be necessary.

* * *

During the first week in May, Chicago saw a remarkable conference, called the National Peace Congress, the second of its kind. A letter from President Taft was read and a number of renowned speakers appeared on the platform, among them President David Starr Jordan of Leland Stanford University; Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor; Gov. Deneen, of the State of Illinois; Rabbi Dr. Emil Hirsch; Rev. Jenkin Lloyd Jones; Miss Jane Addams; Mrs. Fannie Fern Andrews, of Boston; Mr. Edwin D. Mead, of Boston, who was delegate of the American Peace Society to the congresses of Glasgow and Rouen, and chairman of the executive committee of the 13th International Peace Congress, at Boston in 1904; Prof. Graham Taylor, of the Chicago Commons; and Carl D. Thompson of Milwaukee, who represented the socialists.

The general tone of the speeches was denunciatory of war, of its preparations, and of all that belongs to war. The place of meeting was Orchestra Hall, a fairly large auditorium which seats about 1500, and although on the average scarcely more than 500 persons were assembled, not all of them peacemakers, the enthusiastic delegates to the Congress congratulated each other again and again declaring that this was the best meeting so far ever held. Chicago was declared to be the fittest center for a peace propaganda because it was an hospitable and central city, and just as soon as a sufficient number of generous Chicago gentlemen could be found who would add to the funds a guarantee of \$5000.00 a year for five years, the problem of war and arbitration would soon be solved.

President Taft's letter will have the endorsement of every sensible person in the United States,—yea in the whole world. He expresses sympathy with the aspirations to preserve peace, and the tenor of his views is characterized by the following paragraph:

¹ This is probably the correct reading.

"The policy of the United States in avoiding war under all circumstances except those plainly inconsistent with honor and its highest welfare has been made so clear to the world as hardly to need statement at my hands. I can only say that so far as my legitimate influence extends while at the head of this government, it will always be exerted to the full in favor of peace, not only as between this country and other countries but as between our sister nations."

Similar sentiments were expressed by others connected with the administration. Thus M. J. Buchanan, of New York, denounced the yellow press for the mischief it does in creating bad feeling between nations. He said:

"It seems to me that the greatest step toward peace and the greatest step forward toward a better understanding between the countries would be reached if all of us were more temperate and conservative in our views with regard to disputes that arise between our own country, let us say, and some other country. I believe that the best arbitration is to prevent arbitration, to make arbitration unnecessary. In my own experience this has been verified."

We must remember that Mr. Buchanan acted as arbitrator between Chili and Argentina, served as United States Commissioner to Venezuela and sat in the Hague Conference as an American delegate. He condemned formal correspondence between disputing nations and said he reached an agreement to arbitrate the Venezuela cases after a pleasant talk with Castro's minister of foreign affairs lasting twenty-seven days, during which time all letter writing was suspended.

No one could find fault with any peacemaker who bears in mind the exception that war should be waged only when the honor of a nation or its highest welfare is at stake. The spirit of the Peace Congress tended in another direction. It denounced *all* war, and proposed peace at any price.

David Starr Jordan, President of Leland Stanford University, announced his subject as "The Biology of War," but his remarks were chiefly on the deterioration of the classical races, which according to him was due to the slaughter of the best men in war. According to other authorities, the deterioration of Rome was due partly to the neglect of the warlike spirit, partly to the inrush of lower races, among them the Africans. It is true enough as Professor Jordan says that Rome had excellent men even during the period of decay, but she had no heroes. Almost all her officers and soldiers were barbarians. Some of President Jordan's sentences are quite unimpeachable. He says:

"The republic of Rome lasted as long as there were Romans; the republic of America will last as long as its people in blood and in spirit remain what we have learned to call Americans.

"Whatever the remote and ultimate cause may have been, the immediate cause to which the fall of the empire can be traced is a physical, not a moral decay. In valor, discipline, and science the Roman armies remained what they had always been, and the peasant emperors of Illyricum were worthy successors of Cincinnatus and Caius Marius. But the problem was how to replenish those armies. Men were wanting. The empire perished for want of men.

"Does history ever repeat itself? It always does if it is true history. Where the weakling and the coward survives in human history, there 'the human harvest is bad,' and it can never be otherwise."

Rome degenerated when there were no more Romans left like Cincinnatus and Marius. But what kind of men were Cincinnatus and Marius? Where they advocates of peace? Roman history tells us they were fighters. Marius was the only man in Rome who was not afraid of the Teuton invaders. He braced up the failing courage of the Roman legions, to dare in battle and even defeat the foe. Cincinnatus, however, was the man who left the plow to go to war and exchanged the plowshare for the sword.

Rome had enough people of culture, and the Roman army was excellent in valor, discipline and science, but it was composed of Germans and Gauls. The main cause of her downfall was exactly that state of things which our men of peace want to bring about. The Romans had become a peaceful nation and had forgotten how to fight. The result was they had not the courage to risk their lives, so Rome lost her supremacy.

Dr. Benjamin F. Trueblood, secretary of the American Peace Society, speaking on "The Present Position of the Peace Movement," prophesied regular world meetings to promote peaceful settlement of international disputes. In part, Dr. Trueblood's ideas were as follows:

"The powers of the conference will at first be only advisory, but in the nature of the case its conclusions and recommendations will be largely adopted, and in this way it will from the start be substantially a legislative world assembly. Its powers will naturally grow and be extended. Here we reach the real position which the peace movement has attained.

"The promise, therefore, is large for the years just before us, for when the nations meet representatively at regular periods and men of the highest ability and experience discuss in a friendly and frank way all of the common problems of the world the days of war will be numbered."

The literature distributed free of charge at the entrance to the Peace Congress meetings contained, among other things, an address by Charles E. Jefferson, D.D., LL.D., which is entitled "'Peace at any Price' Men." They are those, he says, "who never trouble themselves so much about national 'honor' as about the righteousness

of the national cause." With President Taft most people think that honor and righteousness are not contrasts, but Dr. Jefferson apparently means the wrong honor of jingoism.

Dr. Jefferson insists that "war is *always* unjustifiable, because there is *always* a better way of settling disputes. Killing men is not so good a way of deciding important questions as bringing these questions to the arbitrament of reason. Reason is stronger than force, and justice is more to be desired than might." These sentences contain great truths and they would be perfectly true if we could cancel the word "*always*," which we have here italicized. But it is this "*always*" that Mr. Jefferson insists on. He declares that there are other men of peace who do not favor disarmament. He ridicules them in very sarcastic language and since his arguments are very keenly thought out and sharply expressed we quote from them at length. He presents their views thus:

"Peace is the supreme blessing of the world. Nothing is so destructive and barbaric as war. War is not only hell, it is inconvenient. It interferes with commerce and throws the world's life into chaos. It is the one scourge to be dreaded, the one curse to be avoided. At all hazards and at any cost war must be rendered impossible. If you ask this new peacemaker how war can be escaped, his reply is 'only by colossal armies and gigantic navies.' Lyddite shells and twelve-inch guns are the only guarantees of peace. If nations are not armed they are certain to fight, but if properly equipped with deadly weapons they think only of peace. Nations not cased in armor inevitably fly at one another's throats, but when dressed in steel plate they coo like doves. Every battleship therefore is a nail in the coffin of war. Twenty-six thousand ton battleships are spikes, and no spike can be too long when you are trying to box up the devil. Cruisers and torpedo boats are messengers and tokens of good will. A naval cruise cements nations together wonderfully. Men fall in love when they look at one another through the bore of a gun. Nations are never so friendly as when they sit down in the midst of explosives. The old idea that guns are to fight with is obsolete, they are emblems of amity and work twenty-four hours a day for peace. Torpedo boat destroyers destroy nothing but the last vestige of a desire to fight. Lyddite shells annihilate nothing but fooling notions of waging war. Men spend years at target practice not for the purpose of taking life, but with the sole intention of saving it. It is for peace, therefore, that all military and naval appropriations are granted. The President, when he asks for new battleships, is aglow with enthusiasm for peace. Every Congressman who votes additional millions for cruisers and torpedoes does so in the conviction that in this way he is sounding the death knell of war."

Dr. Jefferson is the pastor of the Broadway Tabernacle church of New York City. His article was published in February, 1909, while the navy appropriation was before Congress, and one can see between the lines the real point of the article. He closes his

peace-making denunciation of war by saying that "the time has come to blow the trumpet and prepare for battle."

The keynote sounded by Gen. Frederick D. Grant was different. He is one of the peacemakers denounced by the Brooklyn pastor. General Grant spoke on behalf of the soldier. What he said was sensible and it would be difficult to upset his statements. He said:

"The soldier's whole profession, and study, and art is that of producing peace. It is your statesmen and your people that create wars. First, the people become irritated, generally through some commercial transaction. The statesmen then take hold of the matter, and they compromise, or try to compromise, if the nations are nearly equal.

"If they are not nearly equal, the stronger one simply slaps the weaker one in the face, and the soldier is called in to settle the difficulty. In the last 300 years I know of no case of war that was brought on by the soldier.

"Again, take the last great war between Russia and Japan. That was not a soldier's war; it was brought on because of a desire of commerce on the part of those two nations in Corea and the holding of a balance of trade and what they called the sphere of influence in China. The soldiers fought it out. As soon as that came about, the English had desires in Thibet and they put the troops there. They did not have much resistance and the troops brought about peace.

"Just before that we had the South African war. Soldiers did not bring that about. The real foundation of that was the big gold mines that they found there. The cube of gold in those hills was too much for a small people like the Boers to have, and the great nation takes it. The Boers gave them some trouble for awhile, and the soldiers settled it.

"Just before that we had a war ourselves with Spain. The people here, of course, think that it was caused by the blowing up of the Maine; that is not true.

"It was previous to that that we had a rebellion in Cuba. In that rebellion they issued bonds. Those bonds were distributed and the rebellion ceased. Those bonds got into the hands of a few commercial men, peace lovers, and they agitated a rebellion there again in Cuba, and then our peace-loving papers, our yellow press, stirred up our people in order that we would take Cuba and pay these bonds to them.

"I was only a soldier there on the field, but I did not bring about that war; I helped to settle it. So you will find that the soldier is the peace lover, whose profession it is to make peace. We love peace so much that when you are in trouble we fight to bring about peace.

"I believe it behooves the people of this country to maintain their army and their navy in an efficient condition, and I believe that 12-inch guns along the coast of the Atlantic and the Pacific, with a well drilled body of men in this country, will do far more toward maintaining peace than all the talk that all the good people of all the countries of the world could do in times that are not strenuous, and when everybody is sitting down to a good table, and have plenty to eat and are feeling happy, contented, and well disposed toward all mankind."

General Grant was pretty isolated. We note among the few who would side with him John Callan O'Laughlin, a Washington newspaper correspondent, who comments in the *Chicago Tribune* on the Peace Congress as follows:

"It is about time for the country to realize that great obstacles lie in the way of universal peace. Much has been done toward ameliorating the hardships of war and in limiting the causes of war. But no nation will consent to arbitration which involves loss of territory or violation of its honor, or, as the Chicago platform puts it, 'which may involve the national life and independence.' This is a broad exception and could be applied to almost any dispute that might arise."

Every country must be able to protect itself, but we do not say that every country should keep a big army or navy; we insist that Goethe's verse is good advice:

"Trotz aller Gewalten
Sich selbst zu erhalten."

The problem of self-defense is different for every country. So, for instance, Germany with her long open frontier of lines has come to the conclusion that her best method of defense is to take the offensive and carry the war into the enemy's country. She needs a strong army. While Switzerland, too weak for aggressive operations, would in case of war, pursue the plan of closing up the mountain passes and prevent the enemy from breaking through her territory. That would be the only reason for which she would be invaded. The United States, however, does not need a strong army as Germany, but it does need a strong navy.

* * *

The banquet given by the Chicago Association of Commerce was an elaborate affair. Several plenipotentiaries from great nations graced the occasion. Conspicuous among them was Dr. Wu Ting-fang from the Celestial Empire and seated beside him was the Hon. Kazuo Matsubara, the Japanese Consul, as a peace delegate from Japan. The French Consul, Baron Houssin de St. Laurent, representative of France, partook of the same cheer as did his neighbor from across the Rhine, Count Johann Heinrich von Bernsdorff, ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of Germany. The Hon. Herman de Lagercrantz, envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of Sweden, represented his nation as Dr. Halvdam Koht, professor at the University of Norway, did his, while England was present in the person of Mr. A. Mitchell Innes, Councillor of the British Embassy. President Taft's proxy was secretary of the

Interior, Richard A. Ballinger; and the Hon. Richard A. Bartholdt, member of congress from Missouri, and the Hon. James. A. Tawney from Minnesota were on the program.

The table of the speakers presented a study in physiognomy. Some of the men and women possessed a complaisant and benign expression which indicated that they could be roused to quarrel only by the idea of war. There were finely cut, noble features with a slight touch of sentiment, or even sentimentality, in their eyes which contrasted well with the combative zeal for a great cause; and who would not be in sympathy with those who demand that war shall be relegated to the limbo of the infernal regions!

The representatives of the foreign countries, especially the Chinese ambassador, were obviously in sympathy with the peace movement! From the tone of conviction they used in commending the idea of American disarmament it seemed as though they intended to write to their respective governments to sell the navy as old iron at once and dismiss the army.

The Chinese have long been a peaceful people. Generals and soldiers are not valued high in their annals. The highest renown and glory is given to sages, such as Confucius and Lao-tze. The army of the Chinese was no match for the European troops and the result is that China's existence to-day is mainly due to the jealousy of the Western nations. Of late, however, she has begun to reorganize the army after the model of European civilization and we dare say that China will be left alone in exactly the proportion that she will be able to resist infringement upon her territory. Requests for 99-year leases on whole provinces will be disregarded as soon as she is strong enough to demand respect for her rights.

The Chinese ambassador, decidedly the most picturesque and interesting figure among the speakers, was the favorite of the audience as he is also the most popular member of the foreign embassies at Washington. It did not matter what he said, whether relevant or otherwise, the guests enjoyed it. His quaint costume together with his very good English made his speech a delightful entertainment. His subject dealt with the charm of American ladies. He alluded to the fact that in his country, women were excluded from banquets and kindred festivities; but for his part he preferred the American custom. In China women were kept strictly at home, while in America they went about everywhere, and when he saw husbands traveling with their wives, he knew at once that there was a state of peace. The burst of applause which interrupted him at this point almost upset his Oriental composure and though

he managed to finish his speech with entire success, one could notice that he was puzzled to know what the joke was in his peace proposition concerning husband and wife.

The German ambassador added his mite to the appreciation of peace. Among other things he said that even in the times of mediæval instability peace was relatively insured by the merchant classes whose power lay in the Hanseatic League. These merchant cities equipped some well-armed battle-ships and called them Ships of Peace, which were to insure the safety of the merchant vessels on the high seas.

Some speakers thought that a democratic country would never go to war because, they argued, only kings and princes quarrel, but the people want peace. The governments were blamed for all international conflicts. This is not true, for the people are more easily excited and inflamed to make war-like demonstrations than governments and if people had to decide questions of war and peace the world would never be at rest.

This age is an age of industry and commerce, and all the world is filled with the desire for progress and the spread of civilization. To be sure we all want education and a higher standard of morality. We want the general application of the golden rule not only in private affairs, but also in the intercourse between nations. But there is a hitch in the realization of this ideal. There are clashing interests, and though we all clamor for justice, the question is, what is justice? In each conflict there are at least two views of justice, and who shall decide? How shall an international dispensation of justice be made, except by the powers themselves for they being sovereign recognize no higher authority. Our peacemakers want an international court, but how can we expect them to submit to a verdict if it can not be enforced, and who will compel the powers to obey? Here is the point where the fallacies of our men of peace come in.

Now and then it happens that interests conflict and the problem of justice becomes to a great extent a question of power. Our friends of peace (one of them said) "have done a little thinking," but their thoughts move in an ideal realm. They have done their thinking without sufficient reference to the actual world. Their arguments are theories and they forget that there is no right in this world except it be backed by might to enforce it.

It is true enough that through the progress of civilization wars have become less and disputes are now settled peaceably more frequently than in former centuries, but this is not due to the propa-

ganda of peace congresses but because both statesmanship and war are now conducted with method and have become sciences.

The principle of war is to defeat the enemy. This does not mean to kill his entire army but to endeavor to compel him to give up those positions which command the situation. The sacrifice of men is made solely for holding or taking positions and to kill the men of the enemy simply because they belong to the enemy or to expose those of one's own party without a definite purpose is now considered barbarous.

While war becomes more and more scientific, it grows more formidable where the decision lies, but otherwise less destructive. Formerly any cannon temporarily taken or lost was spiked to render it unfit for further service. At present no artillery-man would think of spiking his own gun even if by any means the enemy compelled him to abandon it. He would simply render his gun useless for the enemy by taking out of it the part which is necessary to its use, an elastic ring which is fitted into each individual gun by a tedious process and which makes the chamber fire-tight between the barrel and the lock. Without this most essential part the gun is temporarily useless and of no advantage to the enemy.

Destruction in modern warfare has become limited more and more to what is essential, to what is needed to keep one's own position or to take that of the enemy. Unnecessary destruction is brutal, frivolous and stupid and this rule refers also and mainly to human lives. There would be no longer any killing in war to-day, nor a desire to do so, if there could be any other way to compel the surrender of strategic positions.

In a similar way, one might play a game of chess without losing or taking any one of the figures, and to destroy the enemy's property without gaining an advantage is like making a useless move in chess for the sake of taking an unimportant figure, whereby valuable time is lost in which the adversary may gain a position assuring him unimpeded access to his enemy's king.

Here is an instance of the difference of modern warfare and the "club tactics" of the Middle Ages: Two detachments were once sent through the enemy's lines into unprotected villages to interrupt telegraph connections, one of them trained and the other consisting of raw recruits ignorant of modern methods. The first detachment took the keys from the telegraph instruments and disconnected the wires; the second smashed the entire outfit with the butts of their rifles. In the first case, when the victorious army afterwards entered the village the damaged lines could be restored and used with

but little delay, while the destroyed telegraph station could not be used by either the victor or the vanquished and this second case was a senseless work of destruction. The main point was to render the equipment unfit for service but not to destroy it. The plan of taking out certain necessary connections of the telegraph instruments which could not be replaced or refitted except by the help of skilled workmen, was to harass the enemy and prevent the use of the instruments but not to destroy something which might later be necessary to the success of the conquering army. This illustration is not an invention of the fancy. It happened in the Franco-Prussian war of 1871, when the German confederates were not yet uniform in training.

* * *

When the great interests of a nation, her dignity, her rights, the resources of her livelihood or even her liberty and her honor are at stake, men are in duty bound to go to war, to wage battle and risk their lives. There are goods in this world which are higher than human lives. There are super-individual interests, there are ideals dearer than our own persons for which it is worth while struggling, suffering, fighting and dying. Life is not the highest boon of existence, and no sentimental reason, based on the notion of the sacredness of life, will abolish struggle in the world or make war impossible.

The world is not a paradise of unmixed blessings and we progress only by hard work. The welfare of to-day has been wrung from fate with an iron hand by energy and toil. Even peaceful exertions demand sacrifices,—sometimes very hard sacrifices, and it is probable that more lives are lost in the endeavor of industrial progress and even in scientific research than in war. But our friends of peace are possessed with the monomania that war alone devours human life; they seem to forget how many men die in the mines, fall from the scaffolds of edifices in construction, are crushed to death in railroad accidents, die of consumption and other destructive diseases. How many physicians die in their vocation by blood poisoning, etc., and inventors in their attempt to discover new appliances, flying machines or new chemicals. The sacrifices on the altar of progress are untold and the victims on the battlefield who die for the preservation of the liberty of their country are the smaller fraction of the total number lost.

The liberty and prosperity of the nation has been dearly bought by the fathers of this country. The heroes of the Revolution gained

our independence and if we did not possess the strength to defend the liberty they won for us, we would surely lose it sooner or later.

We are now convinced that the independence of the thirteen colonies was their good right, and all the world is convinced of it too because they won in the fight. But in the days of Washington, the question of justice was by no means so plain. England was the sovereign of these settlements; she had charge of the interests of the entire empire, including her colonies in North America, and paid the expenses incurred for their protection. So she deemed it but just that they should defray part of the heavy debt she had incurred on their behalf. She had as much right to have a word to say concerning the government in her colonies as Spain had in Cuba, and when the colonies denied these rights to their government and mother country, they set up a new standard of justice. The letter of the law was distinctly on the side of England and if a new standard was to be recognized, it had to show its right to existence by the power with which it was maintained.

Questions of right are to some extent questions of power, and how shall they be decided unless their representatives are willing to fight for the cause? Remember the story of the lamb and the wolf. The lamb is devoured in spite of its innocence, and as a rule we condemn the wolf because the wolf is also an enemy of mankind and is treated as an outlaw to be killed wherever found. But what about the butcher? Has not the lamb a right to denounce man if he slaughters a harmless animal that never did him the least harm, merely for the brutal and selfish purpose of eating it? And here at the banquet of the Peace Congress were peace delegates eating the tenderloin of meek herbivorous oxen and continuing their banquet with squabs, under which culinary title lie concealed the innocent doves of peace—the same doves which taxidermic art has displayed at the meetings and in the banquet hall by the side of the rapacious American eagle. We may well wonder whether any one of our friends of peace ever thought of it or had his appetite spoiled by the idea that these dainty birds were the emblems of their highest ideal.

The tone of the discussion at the banquet was radical, for the speakers demanded nothing short of absolute disarmament and one of them denounced another movement which while strengthening the navy, proposed to advocate arbitration. He claimed that if the world is to be pacified we must do it in the right way and must have peace at any price. "Why," he added, "these advocates of

peace by arbitration would have us believe that a man-of-war looks like a dove of peace."

It happened in the days when the flag and national emblem were to be adopted that the American eagle was proposed for the coat of arms of the United States. One of the peace-loving delegates of Congress denounced the eagle as a bird of prey and with rustic oratory endeavored to discredit the idea that a peaceful nation should find its symbol in this aristocratic and warlike bird. His antagonist while pointing out that the pride of a nation lay in its power, wittily remarked that if his critic's opinion prevailed, a more democratic and peaceful bird should be chosen for our national symbol, such as a turkey; or better still a goose which would offer an additional advantage, for while a big goose would ornament the dollars a gosling might do for dimes. History tells us that the man who spoke a good word for the eagle was victorious, but nevertheless liberty is not curtailed for no one prevents the goose from gabbling without restriction.²

There have been peaceful people in the world but their experiences are bitter. These men of good will could not long stand the pressure of their less well-intentioned neighbors and in order to survive had to take up sword and shield.

There was a time when Germany was defenseless on all her frontiers and her neighbors knew of it. They poured in from every side and took possession of the border lands without compunction until "good-natured Hans" was aroused to indignation and whipped them out of the country. Then his neighbors complained about his rudeness. If Germany is now too belligerent, it is the result of untoward circumstances for which the neighbors are themselves to blame. There is only one means by which the men of good will may enjoy peace on earth and that is by being themselves so powerful that no rascal dares carry on his villainy.

There are many good people in the city of Chicago who fondly imagine that the city could be run without police, and it is quite true that in some well-frequented parts, the absence of the police would not greatly be noticed. But the condition of civic peace is due solely to the circumstance that men interested in the welfare of the city have the means to enforce order at any moment it might be needed. There is an enormous resource of reserve power which is never utilized and, let us hope, will never be needed, but whose very

² For details of this contest in Congress which even led finally to a challenge, see the author's article "On the Philosophy of Laughing," *Monist*, VIII, p. 269.

existence ensures peace and order. This resource surrounds us unnoticed and none but thinking people will be aware of it; but nevertheless it is present like the air we breathe and in which we live and move and have our being; which is impalpable and the bodily nature of which remained unheeded until a thoughtful scientist measured its presence and proved its actual existence.

The same is true of international safety. There are no pirates on the high seas to-day because they could not live in the presence of modern warships. Perhaps we have forgotten that our own navy exists because there was once an insignificant little pirate, the Bey of puny Tripoli, who levied taxes on our merchantmen and compelled America to pay tribute to him because she had no navy.

It happened in the days before the American navy was respected that some American youths, fired with enthusiasm for Cuba's struggle for liberty embarked with European adventurers in the dangerous undertaking of assisting the rebels. Their ship was caught by a Spanish cruiser and before they had set foot upon the Pearl of the Antilles, they were court-martialled and condemned to death. The English consul at once came to the aid of those of the captives who were English subjects. They were immediately released upon his demand, but the Americans had no one to come to their rescue and were led out one by one and shot,—and this great peace-loving republic did not stir in their behalf, presumably because it would have been ridiculous to have made a remonstrance at Madrid for we had no navy to back our demands.

The late Spanish-American war would never have taken place, had the Spaniards known that our navy was up-to-date. There was a general opinion throughout the world that the Americans were a commercial people who preferred the almighty dollar to national honor and dignity, and at the mere thought of war would shrink from any desire for expansion, or recognition, or national growth. It was commonly assumed that they would not only suffer the slap on one cheek, but would turn the other in Christlike meekness for a second slap, provided they would be allowed to go on peacefully making money. Happily these notions were erroneous, and Spain found out to her bitter loss and humiliation that the warlike spirit of the Saxon blood was still alive in the citizens of the United States. And it seems a fair prediction that while peace congresses may come and go, the spirit of the Saxon will after all remain the same in this fair land until the end of time.

The German army is frequently denounced as a tyrannical institution and the greatest burden of the people. This is a great error which is maintained by social democrats in the fatherland and in the United States by deserters, by those who never served in the army and know of it and its institutions only by hearsay. The writer of these lines has fulfilled all his duties as a German soldier in the ranks as well as an officer in the reserves. He knows what he is talking about and he here most emphatically contradicts the statement that the army is a tyrannous institution and a burden on the country.

The German people are not belligerent, they want war as little as, and probably less than, other nations; for they themselves have to go to war, and mothers must send their own sons, not hirelings nor mercenaries. The German army is simply the German people in arms; and the standing army is a school the influence of which is entirely beneficial.

The men who have served in the army are worth more because of their training. They have learned the meaning of duty; they have become reliable, more orderly in dress and bearing; through military discipline they have acquired self-control, and above all else, they have become more manly. I have not yet met any one who served in the German army and has regretted it.

The national wealth is advanced far more through the army, this school of military training, than it costs to maintain it. Enemies of the army may deny these facts but they cannot refute them. It is true, it costs millions of marks to keep up the army, but when we consider it as a school for the teeming population of Germany the figures are not too high nor out of proportion to its usefulness, and thus even aside from war purposes, not a penny of it is wasted. If the same training could be acquired in the United States for approximately the same cost, we ought to be grateful to have an institution in this country similar to the German army in the fatherland.³

* * *

The progress of civilization has a strong tendency to reduce war, and the curve of war will gradually approach the straight line of peace, but the line of peace is like an asymptote, which means that the curve of war will approach almost to touching; but that even in infinity the two will never coincide. Thus the club law has been

³ In a former article in *The Open Court* the author suggested that some army drill after the pattern of the Swiss army would be a very desirable institution in the United States.

abolished by the institution of courts, but who for that reason will say that civil wars, rebellions, riots and any other kind of civic disturbances have been abolished forever? War becomes rarer and rarer, but not only because people grow more intelligent and more cultured so as to take every possible step to avoid war and settle by arbitration the disputes that involve their respective interests.

The most potent factor that tends to abolish war is the cost of its maintenance. War is daily becoming more expensive. In the ages of club law, war was comparatively cheap. Every baron or robber knight could start a feud without any more risk than the bones of his retainers who were perhaps, like their masters, daring but otherwise good-for-nothing fellows. But nowadays the mere mobilization of an army devours millions and millions of dollars daily, not to speak of the incalculable losses caused by the interruption of commerce and trade. War has grown less because the great powers can not afford to go to war and they gladly welcome the opportunity of arbitration.

One important step toward the abolition of war is noticeable in the increase of the rights of neutrals. Formerly, neutral powers were treated almost like enemies, and even at present they must submit to many infringements (such as search for contraband etc.) which in times of peace would never be tolerated. The time may come when neutral ships will be as much respected as is now neutral territory, and if the belligerents would be held responsible for all damage done to neutrals, the costs of war and the risks of being unable to pay war debts would make war a very undesirable luxury.

Suppose that one of the belligerents sends out a number of floating mines which drift beyond the waters of the theater of war and destroy some vessels of a neutral power. In that case, should not the belligerents be made responsible for the damage done and should they not pay an indemnity just as much as Russia had to pay for the slaughter of the innocent fishermen of Hull?

There is only one way for neutrals to assert themselves; they must compel the belligerent powers, by military and naval forces, to respect their rights. They can not do it by an appeal to justice or an international tribunal—unless the latter has the active support of the majority of the powers.

The International Hague Tribunal is a natural step in the plan of human evolution. It would perhaps have come a little sooner, had its establishment not been retarded by the impatient advocates of piece-at-any-price who suffered under the fond delusion that an international court of judges could be established which would de-

cide the international disputes and dictate to the powers the terms of peace. The Hague Tribunal became an established fact only when it was plainly understood that it would not make the slightest pretense to assume jurisdiction of any kind, and would remain always conscious of the fact that it constituted a mere advisory council without any authority whatsoever over the powers.⁴

The famous European concert of nations is nothing more than the equilibrium of forces, and the several statesmen allow each one of the parties exactly as much of right as they could maintain in a dispute if it were to be settled by the sword. If our sword is rusty it no longer counts. We want peace, but not the peace which would cause our neighbors to speak of us with contempt and treat us as a negligible quantity. Such would be the case if our lovers of peace would have their way.

My kind readers may be under the impression that I am a partisan of war. Such is not the case. On the contrary, I advocate peace. If ever I were in any position to influence a decision on war or peace, I would always endeavor to avoid war, provided there would be no sacrifice of honor or the legitimate rights of the nation. But I know too well that this world is one in which we have to maintain our place, a world in which interests clash and that even in times of peace there is a constant tug of war between the nations. Difficulties are not settled by any such ideals as Tom, Dick and Harry may call justice, but they are so settled that the results are the same as if the different powers actually went to war.

* * *

There were many present at the banquet in Chicago who noticed the fallacies of the speakers' arguments, but they said little. Afterwards I heard it remarked that the speakers were a harmless lot of men and women and if their ideas were based on fallacies they were certainly inoffensive; but we must not be too confident on this point, for when Gladstone, a man of peace, whose peace-loving nature was known to all the world, stood at the helm of England's government, England became implicated in more wars than under his Tory predecessor. Every little power, the Boers in Africa, the Egyptians, the Hindus, thought they could trifle with Johnny Bull with impunity now that he had grown tame* and the result was the very opposite of what the Grand Old Man had dreamed. Now if the sentiments that we must have peace at any price which the Peace Congress

⁴ Concerning the significance of the Hague Conference see the author's article "Peace on Earth," *The Open Court*, XIII, 306.

entertains would influence Congress, our Government will have more and more trouble to secure the necessary appropriations for the expenses of properly maintaining an efficient army and navy. But unfortunate would be the day when our coasts would be left unprotected, and when in the world's history the name of the United States would no longer be heard in the concert of the world powers. No nation will be minded unless she has the power to make good her demands and if the United States were defenceless, how long could it be respected by the world?

In the Sermon on the Mount Jesus said, "Blessed are the peacemakers for they shall be called the children of God." It is truly a noble task to appear as a peacemaker in this world of quarrels, but woe to the peacemaker who steps like a sheep between the lion and the tiger, or to the gosling who interferes with the hawk and the eagle. No one has a right to appear as a peacemaker except he be a man of power. To bring peace on earth is a great ideal, but in order to deserve it we must acquire the strength to perform that grand office.⁵

To disarm or wilfully weaken ourselves is to play the part of the lamb and deliver ourselves over to the wolf. The highest ideal is the spread of good will on earth, but it is worthless unless it be accompanied with manliness and strength, unless our good will be backed by the determination to fight for, yea, even to give our lives for our ideals. We must bear in mind Cromwell's words, "Trust in God and keep your powder dry."

While the aspiration to avoid war and preserve peace is shared by every one, and while so far, the peace congress has our undivided sympathy and support, we cannot help insisting on the seriousness of the blunders made incidentally which we deem important and even injurious. It would go too far to enter into all the slight errors to which the peace congress has committed itself. We will only refer to one little statement which occurs in a flyleaf called "Peace Facts." There it is stated that the pacification of the world has made great progress and that large territories have been neutralized.

While it is true enough that the progress of civilization means an amelioration of warfare, we doubt very much whether it will eventually lead to its elimination. Other so-called peace facts are mistakes. That Switzerland, Belgium, Luxemburg, and Norway

⁵ The peace-at-any-price movement is similar in character to the aspirations of the anti-vivisection movement. The arguments against war are practically the same as those against the latter. An editorial article on this subject appeared in *The Open Court*, Vol. XI, No. 6, p. 370, entitled "The Immorality of the Anti-vivisection Movement."

have been neutralized is a statement for which there is not the slightest authority; Norway has but lately been on the verge of a war with Sweden. Further, that organized labor is against militarism is true enough, but organized labor itself is militant. If there were no militia in this country and no standing army, organized labor would have an easy time to dictate terms where it now clamors for arbitration.

Our Peace Congress passed some resolutions and the last one demands immediate disarmament and obligatory arbitration, but no provision was made in case some nation would not submit. How would an international Hague tribunal enforce its decision if the universal principle were adopted of peace at any price? It is to be feared that deadlocks would frequently be the result. We might just as well pass resolutions for capital and labor, that strikes should be no more; and that before strikes begin, they should be settled by compulsory arbitration. We know that social upheavals come just as disease invades a body, and we might as well pass resolutions that no evil shall befall us; that hurricanes and earthquakes, pestilence, poverty and tidal waves shall be abolished and that the millennium be at once realized on earth.